

REMARKS*The Pending Claims*

Claims 20, 21, 25-27, 31, and 35 have been amended and claim 36 has been added. Thus claims 20-22 and 25-29, and 31-36 are currently pending in the application.

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action dated August 29, 2011, included the following rejections and objections:

1. Claim 35 was objected to.
2. Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
3. Claims 20-22, 25-29, and 31-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kami et al. (US 5,114,180).

Discussion of the Rejections

The status identifier for claim 35 has been corrected and claim 31 has been amended to depend from claim independent claim 20.

Claims 20-22, 25-29, and 31-35 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kami et al. The Office Action states, "Kami discloses a woven air bag having a coating film applied thereon wherein the coating can be on opposite sides of the fabric (see abstract and Example Group 1)". Applicants respectfully ask for clarification on this statement. Applicants have read the cited areas of the Kami et al. reference and have found no statement by Kami et al. that the fabric can have coatings its opposite sides, nor do Applicants understand the relevance of having coatings on opposite sides of a fabric to the pending claims.

The Office Action states that Example 7 of the Kami reference discloses that the woven fabric is a Jacquard woven. Applicants respectfully disagree. Experimental Group 7 was a double woven fabric having the same fabric construction as that in Example No. 16 which was a plain weave (*see Table 1*) that was then joined in a circumferential portion by an interlocking one layer weave using a weaving loom equipped with a jacquard device. (Col 16, lines 25-36 and Table 1). The fabric was a

plain weave not a jacquard weave; the jacquard device was used to join two layers of fabric together but did not create a jacquard woven fabric.

From reading the Office Action, Applicants believe that it is the Examiner's position that having two fabrics each with a coating film on them when placed together with the coating films facing each other would result in the Applicant's claimed coating system. Applicants have amended the independent claims to more clearly recite that the coating system is a two-layer coating system to exclude to layers from different fabrics lying on top of one another. Justification for the claim amendments may be found, for example on Page 1, Field of the Invention section.

Kami et al. teaches that the coating film is 100 g/m^2 which corresponds to 2.94 oz/yd^2 . Independent claim 20 contains the limitation that the first layer is applied to said airbag in an add-on weight of from about 0.3 to about 2.5 ounces/square yard. Kami et al. teaches away from lowering the coating film weight amount stating, "When the coating ratio is lower (Example 4), an inflation characteristic having adequate values cannot be obtained" (Col 14, lines 51-53). Applicants respectfully believe that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to lowering the coating weight of the first layer as Kami et al. has taught that lower coating values would not have adequate inflation characteristics. Further, independent claim 25 contains that limitation that total add-on weight of said coating system applied to said airbag is from about 0.6 to about 3.0 ounces/square yard. If the Examiner position that the coating films on two pieces of fabric form the first and second layers, then the total add-on weight of the coating system would be 5.88 oz/yd^2 with Kami et al. again teaching against lowering the coating weights of the coating films on either fabric layer (see Col 14, lines 51-53).

Applicants respectfully believe that the claims as now presented are novel and unobvious over Kami et al.

Conclusion

In view of the forgoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to allowance. In the event that the Examiner believes that the claims would be allowable with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Fee Authorization: In the event that there are additional fees associated with the submission of these papers, Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner to withdraw those fees from our Deposit Account No. 04-0500.

Extension of Time: In the event that additional time is required to have the papers submitted herewith for the above referenced application to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for any additional time required to make these papers timely and authorization is hereby granted to withdraw any additional fees necessary for this additional time from our Deposit Account No. 04-0500.

May 14, 2012

Legal Department
Milliken & Company
920 Milliken Road (M-495)
P.O. Box 1926
Spartanburg, SC 29304

Respectfully submitted,

/Cheryl J. Brickey/

Cheryl J. Brickey
Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration Number 56,891
Tel # (864) 503-1540